UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/787,421	02/26/2004	Majed M. Hamawy	960296.99187	5432
27114 QUARLES & E	7590 06/05/200 BRADY LLP	EXAMINER		
411 E. WISCO	NSIN AVENUE, SUIT WI 53202-4497	ROONEY, NORA MAUREEN		
WILL WAUKEE,	, W1 33202-4497		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1644	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/05/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

pat-dept@quarles.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/787,421	HAMAWY, MAJED	M.
Examiner	Art Unit	

	NORA M. ROONEY	1644	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>03 March 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth interthan SIX MONTHS from the mailing op). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrumer 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. ☑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a)☑ They raise new issues that would require further cor			cause
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	v);	•	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>NONE</u> .		l be entered and an e:	planation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>2,9 and 17</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>14-16</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a
10.	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Maher M. Haddad/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1644	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The proposed amendments to claim 17 do not overcome the outstanding rejections under 112, first paragraph for reasons of record. Further, the amendments raise new issues as detection of a 55KDa protein has not previously been considered.

The recited claims encompass detection of SEQ ID NO:1 with anti-phosphotyrosine antibody and this method is not enabled for reasons of record. Further, the sample or homogenate thereof is contacted with a labelled antibody that is "capable of binding to the marker protein in the sample or to a fragment of the phosphorylated marker protein in the homogenate that is about 55kDa in size." However, that limitation is only referring to the specificity of the antibody, not to the actual contacting method step. The sample or homogenate is contacted and the extent to which the labelled antibody becomes bound to the marker protein or fragment is detected. Therefore, contrary to Applicant's assertion the claims are directed to all fragments of SEQ ID NO:1.

Applicant's assertion that the detection of other 55KDa proteins would not interfere with the results of the method because the amount of the other 55KDa proteins would be the same in both samples so the presence would be corrected for when determining the results is unpersuasive. There is no way to predict what factors would affect the presence or absence of other 55KDa proteins in the kidney samples. Other 55kDa proteins might be more or less phosphorylated during kidney transplant rejections and there is no way to predict the result.